DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 236 280 UD 023 162

AUTHOR Walker, Sharon; And Others
TITLE Title I Children's Program: Learning to Read Through the Arts. Final Evaluation Report, 1981-82.
INSTITUTION New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, N.Y. Office of Educational Evaluation.
PUB DATE 82
NOTE 31p.; For a related document, see ED 186 863, ED 189 238, and ED 215 067.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Achievement Gains; *Art Activities; Bilingual Education; Compensatory Education; *Cultural Activities; Elementary Education; Integrated Curriculum; *Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; Reading Achievement; *Reading Programs; Special Education; Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Participation
IDENTIFIERS *Learning to Read Through the Arts Program; New York (New York)

ABSTRACT

Learning to Read Through the Arts (LTRTA), a Title I program, offers intensive reading instruction to New York City elementary school students, through the integration of a total arts program with a total reading program. This report presents a brief program description and results of an evaluation of student achievement and teacher participation in 1981-82. During this school year, LTRTA served 677 regular students and 107 special education students in all five boroughs. Students participated in reading-oriented workshops which used theater arts, fine arts, and/or music to emphasize listening, speaking, reading, and writing skills. They also attended a diagnostic/prescriptive reading workshop. In addition, program students attended various exhibitions and performances that culminated in a special festival. Results of the California Achievement Test, used to measure changes in reading levels of the regular students, indicated that all grades surpassed the program objective of five normal curve equivalents. Bilingual and Special Education students also surpassed program objectives, as measured with the Wisconsin Design Skill Development Test. Observations and interviews of classroom teachers indicated that they were actively engaged in hands-on participation in the workshops. Classroom teachers' responses to a questionnaire, designed to assess ways in which LTRTA practices have been carried into the home classroom, were also positive. A number of program recommendations are included in this report. Sample observation forms, teacher interview forms, and teacher questionnaires are also appended. (GC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED236280

Final Evaluation Report

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
T. K. Minter
NYC Bd. of Ed.
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

TITLE I CHILDREN'S PROGRAM: LEARNING TO READ THROUGH THE ARTS, 1981-82

Division of Curriculum
and Instruction
Office of Special Projects

Project Director:
Bernadette O'Brien

Prepared by:

Ancillary Services Evaluation Unit

Sharon Walker, Manager

Istar Schwager, Consultant

Diane Grodinsky, Consultant

New York City Public Schools
Office of Educational Evaluation
Richard Guttenberg, Director
Terry A. Clark, Assistant Director

UD 023 162

1981-82 LEARNING TO READ THROUGH THE ARTS PROGRAM: EVALUATION SUMMARY

Learning To Read Through the Arts (L.T.R.T.A.), a Title I Children's Program, offers intensive individualized reading instruction through the integration of a total arts program with a total reading program. In 1981-82 the program served children from all five boroughs, including special education students, who were reading at least one year below grade level. Most of the students were in grades four to six; grades two through six participated at the Staten Island site.

Students participated in two reading-oriented arts workshops which used theater arts, fine arts, and/or music to emphasize listening, speaking, writing, and reading skills. They also attended a reading workshop which employed a diagnostic-prescriptive approach to reading through individual and small group instruction. The workshops were closely coordinated.

In addition, the program's association with various cultural institutions provided students with field trips to view exhibitions and performances culminating in the Learning to Read Through the Arts Exhibition, Performing Arts, and Film Festival. All children participated in this event.

The evaluation of L.T.R.T.A. in 1981-82 included the following components: 1) assessments of reading achievement of 677 regular students, ten bilingual students, and 107 special education students, and 2) an assessment of ways in which classroom teachers carried the program into their classrooms.

The California Achievement Test was used to measure changes in reading levels of the 677 regular students. The evaluation objective was a mean gain score of five normal curve equivalents (N.C.E.'s), the criterion for success in Title I programs, according to the New York State Education Department. The L.T.R.T.A. students attained an average gain of 12 N.C.E.'s. Gains were greater than five N.C.E.'s in each grade and all were statistically significant.

The Wisconsin Design Skill Development Test was used to assess mastery in reading skills in ten bilingual students. All of the bilingual students mastered at least seven skill objectives which they had failed to master on the pretest.

The special education component was similar to the regular program in procedures and content. The differences were smaller class size and the use of the Wisconsin Design Skill Development Test to assess mastery in four skill areas. Students far surpassed expected objectives (60 percent were expected to pass four objectives), with 91 percent of the students passing four objectives and 81 percent of the students passing five objectives which they had failed to master on the pretest.

Observations and interviews of classroom teachers at two program sites indicated that they were actively engaged in hands-on participation in the workshops. Teachers indicated that participation enabled them to more fully understand the educational needs of their pupils.

Classroom teachers' responses to a questionnaire, designed to assess the ways in which L.T.R.T.A. practices have been carried into the home classroom, indicated the following: 1) reading and art activities were integrated; 2) reading was integrated into other subject areas; 3) teachers began to use teacher-made materials inspired by those used in the program; and 4) all but one teacher reported that the program had a positive effect on their teaching practices.

The major recommendations resulting from the L.T.R.T.A. Program evaluation are the following.

- .Program staff may wish to consider ways to serve more regular and bilingual students.
- .The program should be expanded to accommodate some of the eligible students now on a waiting list.
- .The new practice of having classroom teachers involved in the program should be continued.
- .Strategies should be explored for minimizing time and effort spent establishing and transferring sites at the beginning of the school year.
- .A sustained effects analysis should be conducted to determine if achievement gains are lasting.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	iv
PROGRAM DESCRIPTION	1
EVALUATION METHODOLOGY	4
RESULTS: STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT	5
ASSESSMENT OF CLASSROOM TEACHERS' PARTICIPATION IN THE PROGRAM	
Observation of Classroom Teachers in L.T.R.T.A. Workshops	10
Interviews with Classroom Teachers	12
Classroom Teacher Questionnaires	15
RECOMMENDATIONS	18
APPENDICES	
A. Classroom Observation Form	20
B. Interview Form for Title I Teachers	22
C. Questionnaire for Title I Teachers	23

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Mean Pretest and Posttest Scores on the California Achievement Test for Students in the Learning to Read Through the Arts Program, 1981-82	7
2	Frequency Distribution of N.C.E. Scores on Pretest and Posttest by Quartile For Students in the Learning to Read Through the Arts Program, 1981-82	8

TITLE I CHILDREN'S PROGRAM: LEARNING TO READ THROUGH THE ARTS

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Title I Children's Program: Learning to Read Through the Arts (L.T.R.T.A.) is an intensive, individualized reading program that focuses on the improvement of reading skills through the integration of a total arts program with a total reading program.* The program was offered for two concurrent, 29-week cycles from October, 1981, to June, 1982. Two afternoons a week, Title I eligible children and their classroom teachers in Manhattan, the Bronx, Brooklyn, and Queens were bused to a program site in their borough. In Staten Island, the program was operated in the students' home school. A total of 687 children participated in the regular program, including 677 regular students and 10 bilingual students. In addition, 107 special education students participated in a slightly modified component of the program.

The Regular Program

Except in Staten Island, the program was offered to fourth, fifth, and sixth graders who were between nine and twelve years old and who were reading at least one year below grade level. In Staten Island, children in grades two through six who were reading a year below grade level were eligible for the program. The program was scheduled for 12:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m. at all sites except Staten Island, where it was scheduled for 10:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.

---

*This project was funded by a grant from the United States Office of Education for the sum of $762,156.

At each program site, students participated in two reading-oriented arts workshops where listening, speaking, writing, and reading skills were emphasized. These workshops offered dance, theater, music, painting, sculpture, graphics, printmaking, mixed media, ceramics, and photography. As part of each workshop, language was integrated with art by students recording the day's language experience in their individual writing journals, while the workshop leader recorded this information in a master journal. These experiences included the learning of specialized vocabulary, norm-referenced vocabulary*, reading skills, creative writing, and reading for information, appreciation, and/or pleasure.

In addition, students participated in a reading workshop which used a diagnostic-prescriptive approach to reading and emphasized individual and small group instruction. The reading workshops focused on comprehension, word attack skills, study skills, and reading for appreciation and/or pleasure. The reading-oriented arts workshops and the reading workshops were closely coordinated.

Field trips were an integral part of the program. The program is associated with the Bronx Museum of the Arts, the Brooklyn Museum, the Queens Museum, the Staten Island Children's Museum, Ballet Hispanico of New York, and the New York Aquarium. One day each month was set aside for field trips to museums, galleries, art and educational resource centers, and libraries to view exhibitions and performances.

The Learning to Read Through the Arts Exhibition, Performing Arts, and Film Festival represented the culmination of the year's activities. The

---

*Norm-referenced vocabulary includes words which appear on various graded wordlists and standardized achievement tests.

main exhibition was held at the School of Visual Arts Museum in New York; concommitantly, exhibitions and performances were held at the five Learning to Read Through the Arts Centers as part of this major final event. All children participated.

Parent workshops were held at each site for 90 minutes a week for ten weeks. The workshops, which were conducted by the assistant coordinators and a social worker, focused on how children learn and family life education. Parents participated in hands-on activities geared to teaching them about the program and were offered suggestions on how they could help their children with reading at home. In addition, the parents were invited to observe their children's workshops.

Special Education Component

Over 100 special education students from Queens and Staten Island participated in the L.T.R.T.A. Program in 1981-82, two days per week for 29 weeks. Entire classes, with classroom teachers, were bused to the site in Queens. In Staten Island, the program operated in the home school.

The special education program followed basically the same procedure as the regular Title I L.T.R.T.A. Program, including teacher training and parent workshops. However, in the special education program, group sizes were smaller than in the regular program. Students' shorter attention spans were considered, with materials presented in a variety of ways. Extra assistance was provided for students with special difficulties to enable them to participate in all program activities.

The students participated in a diagnostic/prescriptive reading workshop and two separate reading-oriented arts workshops, which included

painting, sculpture, drama, music, puppetry, printmaking, mixed media, mime, and drawing. The classroom teachers were assigned to one of the reading-oriented arts workshops with the artist-teacher for one part of the day and to the reading workshop for the other part of the day.

They went on regular field trips to the cultural institutions associated with the program, as well as to other museums, cultural institutions, universities, and libraries. They also exhibited their art work along with other Title I L.T.R.T.A. students in the annual Exhibition and Film Festival held at the School of Visual Arts.

EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

The evaluation of the program included the following components: 1) assessments of reading achievement of 677 regular students, ten bilingual students, and 107 special education students; and 2) a process assessment of the ways teachers carried the program into their classrooms.

Student achievement for the regular students was measured with the California Achievement Test (CAT) given on a pretest and posttest basis. The normal curve equivalent (N.C.E.) gains were calculated to determine whether the criterion of five N.C.E.'s was achieved, and the gains were also analyzed for statistical significance using a t-test.

Achievement for the bilingual and special education students was measured using the Wisconsin Design Skill Development Test as pretest and posttest. The test is a criterion-referenced measure of reading skills. Sixty percent of bilingual students were expected to achieve mastery of five objectives on the posttest which they failed on the pretest. A similar criterion was set for special education students; 60 percent were

expected to achieve mastery of four objectives from pretest to posttest.

The process assessment of the ways classroom teachers used L.T.R.T.A. methods and materials was conducted through observations of classroom teachers in L.T.R.T.A. workshops, interviews with classroom teachers, and questionnaires sent to all participating classroom teachers. These data were tabulated, summarized, and presented in narrative form.

The discussion of evaluation findings begins with an analysis of student achievement data for the three groups of students, followed by the process assessment.

RESULTS: STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

The Regular Program

Students in L.T.R.T.A. were tested three times during the school year with the CAT. The L.T.R.T.A. testing program was administered at the student's functional reading level at pretest (October, 1981) and posttest (May, 1982). As part of the citywide testing program, students were administered an alternative form of the CAT in April, 1982 on the student's instructional (grade) level. They were expected to gain five N.C.E.'s from the October pretest to the May posttest on the California Achievement Test in reading, Form C, levels 11 to 16.

Pretest and posttest data for 677 regular students were analyzed using Model A of the U.S. Department of Education's recommended approaches for Title I evaluation.* According to this norm-referenced model, it is expected that without treatment, a student's N.C.E. scores on a pretest

---

*See G.K. Tallmadge, et. al., User's Guide: ESEA Title I Evaluation and Reporting System. Mountain View, California, RMC Research Corp. Prepared for U.S. Department of Education, Revised February, 1981.

and a posttest will be the same, i.e., under no-treatment conditions a student is expected to remain in the same position relative to other students. If the N.C.E. on the posttest is greater than on the pretest, gain can be attributed to the effectiveness of the program. N.C.E.'s are based on an equal interval scale, so they can be aggregated and averaged.

Students in L.T.R.T.A. gained 12 N.C.E's: mean pretest score was 31 N.C.E.'s, while the mean posttest score was 43 N.C.E.'s. Gains ranged from nine N.C.E.'s in grades two and five to 14 N.C.E's in grade three. (See Table 1.) The results of t-tests comparing the mean pre and posttest scores for each grade level show that the gains at each grade level were statistically significant ($p < .001$).

L.T.R.T.A. pupil gains are shown by quartiles in Table 2. Thirty-seven percent of grade three students' scores were in the bottom quartile on the pretest, whereas only 10 percent were in the bottom quartile on the posttest. Another dramatic gain is in the percentage of scores in the third and fourth quartiles; only five percent were in these quartiles on the pretest, but 26 percent were on the posttest. These scores indicate considerable improvement in participants' reading skills, both overall and for each grade level.

All ten bilingual students surpassed the criterion for program success (mastery of five objectives by 60 percent of the pupils). All ten pupils mastered seven objectives, nine mastered eight objectives, and five mastered at least eleven objectives on the Wisconsin Design Skill Development Test.

Special Education Component

Sixty percent of the special education students were expected to

TABLE 1

Mean Pretest and Posttest Scores on the California Achievement Test for Students in the Learning to Read Through the Arts Program, 1981-82[a]

Grade	Number of Students	Mean Pretest N.C.E.	Mean Posttest N.C.E.	Mean Gain	t score[b]
Two	62	38	47	9	7.81
Three	136	30	44	14	17.18
Four	201	29	40	11	14.51
Five	157	33	42	9	13.59
Six	121	32	44	12	14.98
Totals	677	31	43	12	

[a]Pre- and posttesting was administered in October, 1981, and May, 1982, respectively. Test levels 11-16 were used.

[b]All t-tests were significant at the .001 level.

TABLE 2

Frequency Distribution of N.C.E. Scores on Pretests and Posttests by Quartile[a]
For Students in the Learning to Read Through the Arts Program, 1981-82

Grade	Pretest Distribution by Quartile								Posttest Distribution by Quartile							
	1-25		26-50		51-75		76-99		1-25		26-50		51-75		76-99	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Two (n=62)	8	13%	46	74%	8	13%	-	-	2	3%	43	69%	17	28%	-	-
Three (n=136)	50	37	75	55	11	8	-	-	14	10	76	56	41	30	5	4%
Four (n=201)	74	37	126	62	1	1	-	-	24	12	134	66	42	21	1	1
Five (n=157)	34	22	118	75	5	3	-	-	13	8	110	70	33	21	1	1
Six (n=121)	39	32	71	59	11	9	-	-	13	11	70	58	35	29	3	2
All Grades (n=677)	205	30	436	65	36	5	-	-	66	10	433	64	168	25	10	1

[a]As measured on the California Achievement Test.

master at least four instructional objectives at posttest which they had not mastered at pretest. The Wisconsin Design Skill Development Test, forms P and Q, levels A, B, C, and D, were used to assess mastery. Students are pretested at the beginning of the year to determine the areas and levels of skills in which they need instruction. Based on individual student test profiles, the reading teacher then focuses instruction on the skills which the student failed to master on the pretest. A posttest is administered when the reading teacher determines that the student has made sufficient progress in learning the particular skill. The four skill areas emphasized in the program were comprehension, phonetic analysis, structural analysis, and vocabulary.

Nearly all students (91 percent) passed four objectives, 81 percent passed at least five objectives, 66 percent passed six objectives, 50 percent passed seven objectives, and 37 percent passed eight objectives.

ASSESSMENT OF CLASSROOM TEACHERS' PARTICIPATION IN THE PROGRAM

A major focus of the 1980-81 evaluation report was to assess how L.T.R.T.A. instruction was integrated with the home school instruction. Observations were made in home schools to assess in what ways classroom teachers followed up on L.T.R.T.A. activities in their classrooms. At that time, most individual classrooms sent anywhere from one to nine students to the program and classroom teachers did not participate in the program directly, except in the special education component where entire classes, with their teachers, participated. Observations of several sending school classrooms and interviews with the classroom teachers showed that follow-up on L.T.R.T.A. activities was greatly enhanced when the classroom teacher accompanied his/her class to the program and participated in the workshops. The 1981-82 program model was designed to include entire classes in the program and to have classroom teachers accompany their students. The 1981-82 evaluation assessed the effectiveness of this model.

OBSERVATIONS OF CLASSROOM TEACHERS IN L.T.R.T.A. WORKSHOPS

The amount and quality of participation by teachers in L.T.R.T.A. workshops was assessed. Evaluators observed portions of seven different workshop sessions including painting, drama, mixed media, and reading. Observations, which lasted an average of 25 minutes in each workshop session, were conducted at the Manhattan and Queens sites in May, 1982. In addition, the evaluators observed an in-service training session conducted by an assistant coordinator for the classroom teachers at her site.

The evaluators focused on the questions listed in the observation form

(see Appendix A) and recorded additional descriptive information. During all seven of the workshop segments observed, the classroom teachers initiated instruction to individual students. In four of the observations, the classroom teacher initiated instruction to the group as well. During all of the observations, students solicited help from the classroom teacher. Classroom teachers exhibited "hands on" participation during all seven of the workshops by working with students on master journals and individual student journals, specialized and norm referenced vocabulary words, and art materials.

Among the classrooms observed, the classroom teachers' activities were quite diverse. Classroom teachers discussed creative writing ideas with individuals, corrected spelling and grammar errors in students' journals, explained to the group how the L.T.R.T.A. reading instruction related to a past classroom lesson, and helped students focus on the task.

Furthermore, it appeared that in each workshop the classroom teacher and workshop teacher had developed their own team teaching style. In some workshops, the classroom teacher complemented the workshop teacher by circulating through the room attending briefly to individual questions and problems. This freed the workshop teacher to proceed with whole group instruction. In other workshops the classroom teacher provided intensive individual attention to students for a prolonged period, while the workshop teacher circulated among the group. The reading workshop had fewer students than the reading-oriented arts workshop, allowing the classroom teacher to concentrate on intensive individual reading instruction. The reading-oriented arts workshops varied in the kinds of materials used and their novelty to students. Therefore, the amount of direction and the

type of attention students needed also varied considerably.

The evaluators observed one of the monthly in-service sessions held by the assistant coordinator for classroom teachers. The purpose of the session was to brief classroom teachers on curriculum plans, discuss implementation in workshops and classrooms, and provide classroom teachers with the opportunity to share ideas and concerns. Announcements about exhibitions and program events brought the classroom teachers up-to-date on L.T.R.T.A. activities. The assistant coordinator led a discussion on how to reinforce and carry-over into the classrooms particular reading comprehension skills which were the focus of the current workshops. Practical suggestions were made to help teachers carry out the program in the classroom. For example, to help students distinguish fact from opinion, it was suggested that classroom teachers raise such questions as, "How do we know this?", and "What is your source?". The three classroom teachers who attended the in-service session all contributed to the discussion, shared information about their students and schools, and appeared responsive to the topics discussed.

INTERVIEWS WITH CLASSROOM TEACHERS

Six classroom teachers at the Manhattan and Queens sites were interviewed individually by the evaluators, who followed a structured interview protocol (see Appendix B). The purpose of the half-hour interviews was to determine the extent of classroom teachers' involvement in L.T.R.T.A., the benefits of in-service training, carry over into the classroom, and changes in student behavior and learning that teachers might attribute to student participation in L.T.R.T.A.

Teachers were mostly positive about in-service training. They described how sheets with L.T.R.T.A. lesson plans were distributed far enough in advance so the classroom teachers could "dovetail" the plans with theirs or prepare students before the workshops. Ideas for games and activities were shared during the in-service sessions. Teachers noted that the sessions provided the opportunity for feedback about individual student's progress. Behavioral issues were also discussed, such as the interaction between students from different sending schools.

Classroom teachers were positive about the usefulness of in-service training for participation in L.T.R.T.A. workshops. Several teachers described the sessions as "helpful"; another used the word "informative". One commented that the structure of the lesson plans gave both students and teachers a clear focus. Another discussed how important it was to know what the students were doing in all the workshops and how being well-informed enhanced continuity.

All six teachers indicated that the carry-over of L.T.R.T.A. activities to regular classrooms was discussed and encouraged. When asked what opportunities existed for carry-over, classroom teachers gave the following examples.

- L.T.R.T.A. vocabulary is used in the classroom.
- New vocabulary (e.g., from weekly reader) was related back to the program.
- L.T.R.T.A. activities are discussed in the classroom.
- L.T.R.T.A. experiences and field trips are used as a basis for reading and writing activities.
- Individual student journals were started in the classroom.
- A bulletin board for L.T.R.T.A. announcements, honors, and certificates was designated.

- Vocabulary lists and glossaries were kept, using the L.T.R.T.A. format.

- A play was rehearsed in the classroom. L.T.R.T.A. works and photos taken by students were displayed.

It was also noted that the principal in one school announced the L.T.R.T.A. student-of-the-month over the loud speaker. On their own initiative, students took out library books about L.T.R.T.A. workshop areas.

Classroom teachers also noted that they had gained greater perspective on individual students by seeing them in a different context. Such knowledge proved helpful in the classroom and created greater understanding between classroom teachers and their students. One experienced teacher commented that the L.T.R.T.A. diagnostic-prescriptive reading methodology had identified reading difficulties which she could follow-up in the classroom.

Asked whether participation in the program influenced student behavior and/or progress, the comments included: "improved student behavior" and "greater motivation to read". One sixth grade teacher discussed the emotional growth she had witnessed in her students. She felt that moving to a new environment and relating to students and teachers from different schools had increased her students' sense of responsibility and maturity. Several teachers commented on how the program broadened their students' experiences and awakened new interests in them. For example, as a result of studying Shakespeare, several students watched the WNET-TV productions of Shakespearean plays. Teachers noted that students remembered new vocabulary words and were more at ease with creative writing in the classroom.

Many of the teachers described how the L.T.R.T.A. program exposed students to life experiences they would otherwise not know. Teachers citing the lack of arts' facilities at the sending schools noted that the program provided a unique exposure to the arts. Several teachers commented on the expertise and professional knowledge of artist teachers who, as working artists, were particularly enthusiastic and supportive of students in their workshops.

CLASSROOM TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRES

A six-item questionnaire was sent to 38 participating classroom teachers to identify ways in which they had integrated the L.T.R.T.A. methodology into their teaching practices. Thirty-five completed questionnaires were returned to the evaluators. Teachers' responses are summarized below. (See Appendix C for a copy of the questionnaire.)

When asked which L.T.R.T.A. teaching practices were carried into their classroom programs, teachers reported that:

- reading and art were integrated (77 percent);
- reading was integrated with other subject areas (71 percent);
- specialized vocabulary was used (77 percent); and
- teacher-made materials inspired by those used at L.T.R.T.A. were used (54 percent).

Teachers were asked to describe how they incorporated L.T.R.T.A. practices into their classroom lessons. Their responses were as follows.

- Fourteen teachers reviewed reading and art vocabulary.
- Six teachers initiated students' writing journals.
- Six teachers incorporated art activities into other subject areas.

- Three teachers had students maintain a glossary or work file.

The next question asked teachers in what ways students initiated carry over or follow up of L.T.R.T.A. activities in the classroom. Some of the comments made by teachers were as follows.

- Students related L.T.R.T.A. activities to information discussed in class (three responses).
- Children used L.T.R.T.A. vocabulary in class discussions (three responses).
- Students applied the classroom routines adhered to in L.T.R.T.A. in their home classroom (two responses).
- Students performed the dance routines they learned in the program in their home school (two responses).
- One group of students demonstrated the art techniques they learned for other classes in the school (one response).

More than 83 percent of the teachers reported that the L.T.R.T.A. staff had been very helpful in answering questions about program methodology and suggesting ways in which the program might be carried into the classroom. Between 82 and 97 percent of the teachers reported that L.T.R.T.A. staff has been very receptive to teacher input regarding individual student behavior, individual student achievement, and classroom teaching priorities.

Forty-two percent of the teachers reported that participation in the program had a strong positive influence on their teaching practices; 55 percent reported that the program had a moderate positive influence; and only one teacher reported that the program had no influence.

Finally, teachers were asked to suggest ways in which the program could be further integrated with their classroom teaching programs. Sixteen teachers did not respond to this question and no single response

was mentioned by more than three teachers. The one suggestion offered by three teachers was that more joint planning sessions be scheduled between L.T.R.T.A. staff and classroom teachers. Suggestions offered by two teachers each were: have the artist teacher meet with the classroom teacher before the lesson is taught in order to familiarize the classroom teacher with the day's activities; have L.T.R.T.A. staff come to the home school to conduct lessons; and have the whole class attend the same workshops so that the classroom teacher can reinforce the lesson or concepts in the home classroom.

Two teachers offered unsolicited praise of the project. One teacher commented that she found her experience in the program very rewarding and one that could be carried into other educational settings. The second teacher commented that the program helped her students to work more effectively and helped her to know her students more fully.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations are based on the assessments of student achievement, site observations, and classroom teacher interviews and questionnaires.

1. Brooklyn has a long waiting list of students eligible for the program. Because of the size of the borough and the number of eligible children waiting to participate, it is recommended that ways be investigated to serve these children.

2. Several benefits were gained by classroom teacher involvement in the program. Teachers were exposed to the L.T.R.T.A. teaching methodology and were able to incorporate L.T.R.T.A. teaching strategies and philosophy into their classrooms. Therefore it is recommended that classroom teachers continue to participate in the program along with their Title I eligible pupils.

3. The time and energy spent by the L.T.R.T.A. staff establishing and transferring sites in the beginning of the year causes real concern which should be seriously addressed by administrators in L.T.R.T.A. and the Division of Curriculum and Instruction. One solution to this problem may be to house the L.T.R.T.A. program sites in the city schools identified as community education centers.

4. Throughout the 11 year history of the program, analysis of student pre- and posttest achievement data has consistently shown achievement gains from the beginning to the end of the project year. Furter evaluation research should examine whether the achievement gains made during the year are sustained during the following school year, when students no longer receive program services.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Title I Children's Program: Learning to Read Through the Arts

Observation Form

Observer _____
Site _____
Date _____
Time: From _____ To _____

1. Does classroom teacher initiate instruction to

individuals _____
group _____

Comments: _____

_____

2. Do pupils solicit help from classroom teacher?

yes _____
no _____

Comments: _____

_____

3. Does classroom teacher exhibit "hands on" participation with materials during portion of workshop observed?

yes _____
no _____

Comments: _____

_____

4. Does classroom teacher work with students on:

master journal _____
individual student journal _____
norm-referenced vocabulary words _____
special vocabulary words _____
other

Comments: _____

_____

Observation Form (cont.)

Brief description of activities observed with focus on participation of classroom teacher:

_____

_____

_____

In-Service Training Topic: _____

Description of Activities: _____

_____

APPENDIX B

Title I Children's Program: Learning to Read Through the Arts

Teacher Interview Form

Interviewer _____
Site _____
Date _____

(For Interview with Classroom Teachers Participating in Learning to Read Through the Arts.)

I. A. What is your reaction to the in-service training?

B. Has in-service training been useful to you for your participation in the Learning to Read Through the Arts workshops? How?

C. Has staff discussed means of carry-over from Learning to Read Through the Arts program to classroom?

II. What opportunities have there been for carry-over from the Learning to Read Through the Arts program to your classroom?

III. From your prespective, has participation in the program influenced student behavior and/or learning progress in your classroom?

IV. Would you like to comment briefly on your overall reaction to the program?

OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL EVALUATION

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR TITLE I TEACHERS PARTICIPATING IN
THE LEARNING TO READ THROUGH THE ARTS PROGRAM

Check one:

Special Education_____
Regular_____

Site:_____

1a. Which of the following practices have you carried into your classroom program, as a result of your participation in L.T.R.T.A.? Check as many as apply.

Integration of reading and art_____

Integration of reading and other subject areas_____

Individualized lesson plans based on L.T.R.T.A. diagnostic profile_____

Use of teacher-made materials inspired by those used at L.T.R.T.A._____

Adoption of L.T.R.T.A. lesson plan formats_____

Use of any of the following:

master journal_____
individual student journals_____
norm-referenced vocabulary_____
specialized vocabulary_____

Use of classroom management techniques observed at L.T.R.T.A._____

1b. If you checked <u>any of the items in question 1a,</u> please answer the following.

Specifically describe how you incorporated one or more of the L.T.R.T.A. practices into your classroom lessons.

_____

_____

_____

_____

O.E.E.-3/82

2. In what ways have students initiated carry over or follow-up of L.T.R.T.A. in the classroom (e.g., activities, concepts, achievement)?

3. How have L.T.R.T.A. staff been helpful in:

-answering questions about program methodology?
very helpful____
somewhat helpful___
not helpful____

-suggesting ways in which the program may be carried into the classroom?
very helpful____
somewhat helpful____
not helpful____

4. How L.T.R.T.A. staff been receptive to your input regarding:

-individual student behavior?
very helpful____
somewhat helpful____
not helpful____

-individual student achievement?
very receptive____
somewhat receptive__
not receptive____

-classroom priorities?
very receptive_____
somewhat receptive__
not receptive____

5. Overall, please rate the extent to which participation in the program has influenced your teaching practices:

strong positive effect_____
moderate positive effect_____
no effect_____
negative effect_____

Any anecodotal information to support your rating would be appreciated.

_____

_____

_____

O.E.E.-3/82

6. Do you have any suggestions for ways that further integration between the program and regular classroom instruction may be achieved? Please comment.

Thank you for your cooperation.